

IGIC Data Sharing Committee Meeting Minutes for Friday, April 18, 2008

April 25, 2008

The second Data Sharing Committee conference call was held on Friday, April 18, 2008, between 10 a.m. and 11:30 a.m. We experienced some technical difficulties preventing conference call participants from connecting. After a brief delay, the agenda was reviewed and the meeting started.

Below is a list of those participating in the conference call:

Steven Hook (*chair*)
Jill Saligoe-Simmel (*co-chair*)
Jim Sparks
Steve Leatherman
Deb Martin
Lorraine Wright
Brad Meixell
Mike Morris
John Milburn
Kevin Holly
Christopher Milne

The "Our Mission" section of the agenda was reviewed by Jill. She pointed out that the primary mission of the data sharing committee is to identify and prioritize options for data sharing in Indiana. Developing a data sharing implementation plan is the committee's long term goal.

Steve presented a brief review of data sharing issues discussed by IGIC board members at the Thursday, April 17th, board meeting. Topics included:

- A need to document new court cases covering copyright;
- How local data may become unnecessary if Google Earth and Microsoft pursue their own avenues for obtaining local data and including this information on their webmaps;
- The importance of data sharing driving economic development;
- The necessity of providing examples of stories where local GIS data plays a role in solving issues affecting diverse sectors;
- The importance of not overlooking the funding of continual maintenance of requested local GIS data.

Discussion bypassed the topic of copyright and focused on the importance of GIS data for supporting economic development opportunities. Jim pointed out the fact that many local governments are not aware of economic opportunities. He also said that many economic development professionals indicate that many companies will look for sites without local governments realizing they are being considered. Since many companies rely upon GIS information for determining site locations, Kevin asked whether companies first approach the state for site location assistance. Site selection is a process of narrowing site options based on specific criteria. Companies routinely hire professional

firms accessing nationwide data sets before considering statewide or local data sets. Jill said that companies usually work with the county's economic development professional once site selection has been narrowed. This emphasized the importance of making local and statewide data sets broadly available.

Steve H. proposed having the data sharing committee document business cases and status of local government meeting their business plan regarding data provisioning and charging fees for requested data.

- Mike mentioned how the city of Noblesville freely distributes GIS data for site selection. Restrictions are only placed on two data layers: sanitary and storm lines.
- Brad mentioned how Tele Atlas contacts Clark County for monthly data updates. Brad has seen benefit to the county by providing updated data locations used within GPS location devices such as Tom Tom. Clark County provides data freely.
- Jill asked if Brad could quantify savings gained in not having to respond to GIS data requests. Brad mentioned how he would see a benefit in reduced data requests by providing data to the IndianaMap.

Jill stated that we have many success stories about data sharing. How do we successfully communicate the message of data sharing?

- Kevin mentioned conducting conference presentations to commissioners.
- Jill mentioned producing a glossy brochure documenting experiences to communicate the message of data sharing.

Jill was asked if the Ramona GIS inventory website could provide information showing the percentage of counties that share and that charge for data. Ramona shows that of the counties replying to data sharing questions: approximately 1/3 of counties charge for data; 1/3 of counties give data freely; and 1/3 of counties don't distribute their data.

Brad asked what the arguments for not sharing data are. Steve L. provided much insight into this question. Steve L. explained how counties: 1) participate in cross-county E-911 data sharing; 2) provide data free of charge to companies doing county related business; 3) assess data request fees to other for-profit companies; and 4) offer fee-based web access to county GIS data. Steve L. also mentioned some of the reasons counties are not so willing to share data.

- Cost recovery issues/perceived loss of revenue.
- Legal concerns regarding liability with regards to the Access to Public Records Act (APRA). Is GIS data in the public domain and/or considered copyrightable?
- Based upon interpretation of APRA, county attorneys advise County Commissioners of their rights to data ownership and their ability to sell the data.
- Interpretation of APRA leaves questions open regarding liability (e.g. if it is not public domain, then the commissioners have a responsibility to protect it).
- The strong sense of "ownership" of data presents challenges (e.g., power to make decisions about it).
- Sharing is complex regarding how and why data is exchanged—an example of this is seen with emergency management and local to local data sharing.
- **The real issue:** Local governments need (or expect) support to cover cost of providing data (e.g., time and materials). Under APRA, it is legitimate for a

governmental agency to recoup costs—for time and materials—for providing access to information.

Jill mentioned that money from the Address Integration project can be used for providing a legal opinion and clarification on: 1) GIS data and copyright issues; 2) interpreting APRA with regards to access to local data, charging maintenance fees and restricting commercial redistribution; and 3) what happens to data once obtained by others. It is Jill's opinion that having a review of the ARPA code is a neutral stance for IGIC. Jill sees this task completed within the next two months.

Jill suggested two tasks be performed in response to this discussion:

- Request Publicity Committee create a communication piece that can be used to inform—including personal quotes—present this piece to the following groups: Indian Association of Cities and Towns (IACT) and the Association of Indiana Counties (AIC).
- Have the Data Sharing committee create a bulleted list of business cases and provide quotes to make the issues more personal.

Steve L. mentioned that state agencies already have programs that work with these framework layers. He asked why the state hasn't linked these programs with requirements to provide data and funding mechanisms (e.g., transportation—roads and bridges; E911 addresses; DLGF addresses)? Jim Sparks said he wasn't sure why. Jim also said that the DLGF hasn't requested parcel data recently or address points. Lorraine stated that INDOT has worked with road centerlines.

Brad, who is on the E911 board, mentioned that E911 money has been spent on GIS, but that there is currently very little funds available. In 2006, up to \$15 million was reimbursed back to counties for E911 expenditures. E911 funds were originally directed at phase 2 E911 implementation reimbursement. Senate bill 359 was written to change 911 funding stateside, but it died. HB104 did provide for PSAP consolidation, however, funds are frozen until counties comply.

Steve H. proposed that the committee document what funds the state currently provide to local government through existing sources: E911, DHLS, INDOT, etc. This funding can be seen as support the state already provides to local government. Jill proposed that the committee create a bulleted list showing business cases and seek quotes.

Steve H. asked Jim to review the proposed joint data request for participation letter that will be sent to county commissioners. The letter is a joint request on behalf of IGIC, DHLS, DLGF, INDOT, and the GIO for four GIS layers: address points, road centerlines, political boundaries, and parcel boundaries. Other support letters will be sent to the Indiana Business Research center, and Economic Development Association.

Deb M. brought up the point that some counties maintain their GIS data through their council of governments (COG). These organizations aren't controlled by the public sector. How do we best communicate with these organizations for requesting their GIS data? May there be a possible loss of leverage? Jill stated that she would follow-up with Deb after the conference call to learn more.

Jill spoke about how the Publicity Committee has designed postcards referencing the IndianaMap website. The postcards are directed to county commissioners. Jill is also

reaching out to Economic Development organizations to encourage them to support the IndianaMap and speak with their county commissioners. Jill has also targeted Sheriffs to have them send letters of support to their county commissioners. PSAP coordinators have been identified as another target group to speak with and gain their support. Brad will provide Jill with a PSAP contact list. Jill will follow-up with Brad after the conference call.

The committee briefly discussed our role in the statewide data integration plan. Jill said that the committee will shoot for the end of August for putting together the plan. Jill proposed that committee members consider reviewing and contributing in writing parts of the plan. Jill will be responsible for assembling the overarching document.

In summary, Jill said that the committee should focus on providing business cases along with quotes. Send these examples by email through the data sharing listserv. With approximately 10 minutes remaining for our conference call, the meeting ended around 11:20 a.m.

The committee's next scheduled conference call will be held on Friday, May 23, at 10 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.